

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Finally, claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Application 9-225975 ('975) in view of German Patent 69416356 ('356) or Buzzell.

As a preliminary matter, the disclosure is objected to, for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. Applicant amends the specification, as indicated herein, and submits that this amendment obviates the Examiner's objection to the specification.

§112, first paragraph, Rejections - Claims 9 and 10

The Examiner rejects claims 9 and 10, which were added in the previous Amendment, for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. Specifically, the Examiner states that the limitations of claims 9 and 10 are not described in the specification.

Applicant amends claims 9 and 10, as indicated herein, and believes that these amendments obviate the Examiner's rejections of claims 9 and 10. Support for these amendments can be found at page 8, lines 28-30 and page 9, lines 24-30 of the specification.

§112, second paragraph, Rejections - Claims 11 and 12

The Examiner rejects claims 11 and 12 for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. In response, Applicant amends claims 11 and 12, as indicated herein, and submits that

these amendments obviate the Examiner's § 112, second paragraph, rejections of claims 11 and 12. Applicant submits that these amendments do not require further search or consideration, as the substance of claims 11 and 12, even as amended, remain intact.

§103(a) Rejections(JP'975 / GP'356 or Buzzell) - Claims 1-12

The Examiner rejects claims 1-12 under § 103(a) for the reasons set forth on pages 3-4 of the Office Action. Essentially, with respect to the claims examined in the previous Office Action, the Examiner maintains the same rejections.

With respect to independent claims 1 and 5, Applicant maintains the arguments set forth in the previous Amendment, and submits that claims 1 and 5 are patentable over the applied references at least based on the following reasons.

First, Applicant submits, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, that the cited reference GP'356, described hereinafter, does not disclose any defined convex portion on a moving mold for forming recesses of wall thickness, as described in the claimed invention. There is no description in GP'356 specifically corresponding to the description of the injection molding apparatus "being provided with defined convex portions on said moving mold and the defined convex portions forming recesses of wall thickness at portions not serving as sealing faces of the seal member," as recited in claim 1.

More specifically, at page 14, line 8 to 19 and page 15, line 1 to 11 in GP'356, for example, GP'356 only discloses that cooling is delayed most in the thick-walled portion shown in Fig. 1, thereby a surface sink occurs. To cope with this disadvantage, when the second pressure delay timer ends counting, the second pressure plate 39 starts moving forward and the

second partial pressure pin 35 also starts moving forward to press the resin of the injection boss portion 21b into the cavity 21. Accordingly, even when the internal portion of the cavity 21 is disconnected with the runner 19 and the resin in the cavity 21 is contracted by cooling down after stopping the injection, the resin in the injection boss portions 21a and 21b can be pressed into the cavity 21 by the first and the second pressure pins 34 and 35. As a result, resin pressure can be uniform or even in the cavity 21, thereby making it possible to prevent a surface sink at the thick-walled portion. Nowhere, however, does GP'356 teach or suggest the limitation quoted in the paragraph directly above.

Further, as indicated above, Applicant maintains the arguments set forth in the previous Amendment, including the argument that Buzzell relates to fastener elements, which is quite different from that of the present invention, and that Buzzell relates to a mold releasing of a molding (product) having an undercut. Buzzell, however, does not disclose any defined convex portion on a moving mold for forming recesses of wall thickness. Moreover, Applicant maintains that one skilled in the art, in view of the applied references would not have been led to combine Buzzell with JP'975, to arrive at Applicant's invention, at least because Buzzell's technical field is quite different from the present claimed invention.

Also, Applicant submits that none of the references, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest the feature of Claim 5 of the present invention, "being provided with defined concave portions on said moving mold and the defined concave portions forming ribs at portions not serving as sealing faces of the seal member".

Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-4 and 6-12 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 5.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Diallo T. Crenshaw
Registration No. 52,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 28, 2003